REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 16, 2004 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1 to 9, 15 and 18 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 15 and 18 are the independent claims. Claims 1 to 9, 15 and 18 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the office action, Claims 1 to 5, 8, 9, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,426,800 (Mizuno) and U.S. Patent No. 5,339,134 (Nakamura). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mizuno and Nakamura and U.S. Patent No. 5,513,126 (Harkins). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns controlling a display on a data processing apparatus, which provides for input by an operator of the apparatus, by determining whether a predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last instruction input by the operator, and displaying information on the data processing apparatus in a case that the predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last input of an instruction.

By virtue of this arrangement, in a case that the predetermined period of time has elapsed, it is likely that the operator has at least temporarily concluded the input using the display, and it is therefore possible to use the display to display a message without causing undue confusion or interruption of the operator.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 defines a data processing apparatus comprising instruction input, process, connection, storage, display, discrimination and control units. The instruction input unit is arranged to input a manual instruction by the operator, the process unit is arranged to execute a predetermined process

based on the input by the instruction input unit, and the connection unit is arranged to connect with an external device. The storage unit is arranged to store message data received from the external device through the connection unit. The display unit is arranged to display the message data stored in the storage unit. The discrimination unit is arranged to discriminate whether a predetermined period of time has elapsed since a last input of an instruction by the operator. The control unit is arranged to control the display unit to display information based on the message data received from the external device through the connection unit and stored in the storage unit, in case the discrimination unit discriminates that the predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last input of an instruction.

The applied art, namely Mizuno and Nakamura, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-identified features, particularly as regards the discrimination unit arranged to discriminate whether a predetermined period of time has elapsed since a last input of an instruction by the operator, and the control unit arranged to control the display unit to display information based on the message data received from the external device through the connection unit and stored in said storage unit, in case said discrimination unit discriminates that the predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last input of an instruction.

The Office Action concedes that Mizuno fails to show an operation in a predetermined period of time after an instruction has been input. It is therefore submitted that Mizuno also fails to show a discrimination unit arranged to discriminate whether a predetermined period of time has elapsed since a last input of an instruction by the operator, and the he control unit arranged to control the display unit to display information

based on the message data received from the external device through the connection unit and stored in said storage unit, in case said discrimination unit discriminates that the predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last input of an instruction.

Nakamura is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to Mizuno. Nakamura is seen to disclose a device that operates in both a file mode and a copy mode. The system described in Nakamura is seen to enter a stand-by state and unless an optical disk is inserted in the system's drive, the system waits in a copy mode. When a user inserts an optical disk, the system switches from the copy mode to a file mode. The system then examines the automatic document feeder (ADF) to determine whether a user intends to input information or retrieve information, and if the system determines that the user does not intend to input files from a check of the ADF, the system enters a stand-by state. Once a period of time has elapsed after the system enters the stand-by state the system switches from the filing mode to the copying mode. See Nakamura, col. 13, line 26 to col. 14, line 10.

However, checking an ADF for documents to determine whether a user intends to input documents, switching to a stand-by state if it is determined that the user does not intend to input documents and then switching from a file mode to a copy mode after a certain period has elapsed since the system entered the stand-by state is not seen to be the same as determining whether a predetermined period of time has elapsed since a last input by a user, and then controlling a display to display information based on a received message if the predetermined period of time has elapsed since the last user input.

Harkins is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted with respect to Mizuno and Nakamura.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 15 and 18 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Carole A. Quinn

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 82308v1